

liberals, environmentalists, international accommodationists and other aspiring groups, with a Polish born foreign policy hawk thrown into the bargain.

We were certainly critical at the time, and in retrospect that administration had some of the earmarks of a children's crusade. But at least it

UNCLASSIFIED
 and such is our lot. What we know is that this materialist, pragmatic political culture has brought us to where we are and that many political leaders elsewhere in the world look upon it with begrudged envy. It won't hurt for us to savor that achievement a bit as we confront a new year.

The Soviets' Lawyers

It's notoriously hard to win a libel case in this country. It's harder still if the defendant is the Soviet Union. But it's really tough if once you've won the case, State Department lawyers help the Soviets avoid paying the judgment.

This is the situation faced by Raphael Gregorian, owner of a medical-supply company based in Palo Alto, Calif. He did business with the Soviets for 15 years until an article in *Izvestia* in 1984 branded him a spy. Mr. Gregorian, who was born in Russia, says he's no spy and decided to respond the American way, by suing.

He filed a \$10 million libel claim in federal court in 1984, naming as defendants *Izvestia*, the Soviet Union, its Ministry of Foreign Trade and two Soviet trading firms that have funds in the U.S. The Soviets have a strict policy about U.S. courts: They only appear as plaintiffs. When by last June no one from the Soviet side showed up, Federal Judge David Kenyon in Los Angeles made the obligatory ruling for when the defendant is a no-show. He granted a default judgment, awarding Mr. Gregorian \$456,000.

Then Mr. Gregorian had to try to collect. The Soviets didn't respond to his demands for the damages. So in October Mr. Gregorian sent his lawyer, accompanied by U.S. marshals, to the Chevy Chase, Md., apartment of *Izvestia*'s Washington correspondent, Leonid Koryavin. The lawyer attached the most valuable asset he could carry, Mr. Koryavin's Cyrillic-language typewriter. Then Judge Kenyon ordered Bank of America to turn over accounts held by Soviet trading companies to Mr. Gregorian to make up the rest of the damage award.

This made the Soviets nervous. Earlier this month, they filed suit in New York demanding \$15 million from Mr. Gregorian and Bank of

America, which has frozen the Soviet assets. The New York judge last week said the Soviets should bring their countersuit in Los Angeles.

The big stick on the Soviet side is the U.S. State Department. Two years after Mr. Gregorian filed his suit, State this month filed a "statement of interest" urging Judge Kenyon to reverse the judgment. State cited the legal principle known as "sovereign immunity," which says countries should not be liable in other countries' courts. State also recently invoked sovereign immunity for the Soviets in a case demanding Moscow account for anti-Nazi hero Raoul Wallenberg, who may still be in a Soviet jail.

Now, we doubt Mr. Gregorian would have succeeded if the Soviets had chosen to defend themselves. Sovereign immunity is indeed a familiar concept, though State takes a rather sweeping view in applying it to any enterprise in a communist state. Even without sovereign immunity, there are serious jurisdictional problems with his suit. Mr. Gregorian's case stands mostly as testimony to the risks of doing business with the Soviets.

Still, the basic problem here is that the Soviets refuse to give our courts even the courtesy of a defense. It's galling to have State acting as their lawyers. It's doubly galling for State to complain, as it did in the Gregorian case, that the Soviet side of matters hasn't been heard. It also insisted that the case should be dismissed because it's upsetting superpower relations. Its statement says Mr. Gregorian's case makes bilateral relations more difficult and could even put at risk a new arms control agreement.

State ought to let the Soviets hire lawyers to make their own arguments. Such pleadings in the face of Soviet intransigence are not only bad law but bad foreign policy.

(E870A)
 from continued... these needs, probably would exist and would disturb no one, and it just might be the perfect solution.

Learning that a particular band of a row or a particular type of place is very special to children, read and who have an interest about the unknown elements of the Older adults can read about this existing world, what's more they have the ability with the children. While the older not have the special training of childhood teachers, they would be pleasant, not a substitute for, students and grandparents, after a need diploma. Conversely, some adults might have ambulatory that call out to children who have tripas energy and desire to learn, broader than the child who has something for someone else.

Voluntary Participation

Walk through a model dual center for a moment. Most facilities wouldn't need to be modified; it centers would need only a few more. One room for a small one fire, and a shared recreation room and a small kitchen.

Now, you might think the center, given such a simple, still in day-care centers, which without welcome the idea, with voluntary participation, concrete about temperamental patibility need not be a problem, would working mothers respond. How could they be convinced?

To promote the idea, working could be offered half-price subsidy experiment, providing the initial. The elderly could be bused to children's day-care centers just as now being driven to their own. It could be coordinated so that public buses are used at times when the needed for schoolchildren. It would be paired with a designated parent.

'Adored Attention'

Preventing staff burnout has the problem of both adult and care centers. Dual day care would ease some of the pressure off. The two regulated groups can come together, will grow intellectually, gaining the edge of age and experience; they can recapture the sparkle of life from and both will gain the special "adored attention."

Cost-effectiveness needs to be a true test, perhaps by the government's day-care centers for welfare centers. This would free government from other people in the community. Dual day care would be especially for families with both day-care

As another, I see the minute problems, what is it, well and just can't wait until the adult. I am not looking for a future in adult day care, but a piece of stationery because I

UNCLASSIFIED
 BEST COPY AVAILABLE